

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This RCE is responsive to the final Office Action dated February 12, 2004 in the Above-identified reissue application. In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects all the pending claims 1- 43 and 45 as being obvious over combinations of Cameron et al , Silverman, Taylor and Ginsburg under 35USC §103(a). The Examiner further rejects claims 1 - 43 and 45 for language deficiencies under 35USC §112.

Applicants have further amended independent claims 1, 2, 3, 20, 31 and 42 to better define the present invention so as to overcome the rejections under 35USC §103(a) and the language deficiencies under 35USC §112. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the Examiner's based on the amended claims as well as the following detailed explanation.

As explained in the Background portion of the original Specification, the centralized filtering means of the present inventive system conducts matching tasks to determine the matching buyers and sellers without a database for storing RFQs from the buyers or the offers from the sellers. In particular, as taught by the present invention, the RFQs are sent from the buyers (but not from the centralized filter means) to the sellers determined by the centralized filter means, as now expressly defined in amended independent claim 1, and defined in amended independent claims 2, 3, 20, 31 and 42 in similar language. Applicants believe amended claims 1, 2, 3, 20, 31 and 42 are not obvious over combinations of the references cited by the Examiner, as explained in more detail below.

In Cameron et al (US Patent No.5,832,459) stores a set of offers from a catalog at a central database. Users of the database may then search the database for goods or services offered for sale (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 5-15). There is no teaching in Cameron

that the RFQs are sent from the buyers to the sellers which are determined by the filter means.

Silverman et al (US Patent No. 5,924,082) teaches a matching system to match bids and offers. Silverman, however, does not teach that the bids are sent from the buyers to the matching sellers. To the contrary, Silverman requires that the bids and offers be stored in the matching system (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 31-33) and therefore the bids (as well as the offers) are provided from the system (but not from the buyers) to the matching seller. Obviously, a database is required in Silverman to store the bids and offers, which is exactly the problem that the present invention addresses in the application.

Although applicant's invention does not rule out the use of temporary storage for any of the data, it eliminates the problems of Cameron and others like it, because it does not require a constantly updated massive central database that stores every possible product or service that is available at any time by a seller. Instead, sellers are matched with buyers when necessary.

Applicants have also reviewed another two cited references, Taylor and Ginsburg, and cannot find any teaching or implication in them the distinguishing feature that the RFQs (or other information) are sent from the buyers to the sellers which are determined by the centralized filtering means.

Therefore, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 2, 3, 20, 31 and 42 are not obvious over the combinations of the cited references, and are therefore patentable. At least for the same reasons, dependent claims 4-19, 21-30, 32 – 41, 43 and 45 are also patentable as each of them includes all the limitations independent claims 3, 20, 31 or 42.



In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending are allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaplan & Gilman, L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Telephone 732/684-7634

RECEIVED
JUN 02 2004
GROUP 3600

DATED: May 26, 2004

Jeffrey I. Kaplan
(Reg. No. 34,356)

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service, as first class mail in a prepaid postage envelope, addressed to Mail Stop Reissue, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22813-1450 on May 26, 2004.

Dated: May 26, 2004

Signature

Print Name Fern Pekarofski